

Author: Dr Nathan MacDonald

Address: St John's College

Cambridge

CB2 1TP

United Kingdom

Email: nm10011@cam.ac.uk

Abstract: In 1992 Timo Veijola argued that the love commandment in Deut 6:5 was an interpolation into the *Shema*. On the basis of its vocabulary he showed it to be consistent with a late deuteronomistic stratum in Deuteronomy, which he labelled the *Bundestheologische Redaktion* (DtrB). In this essay I argue that Veijola's argument about the integrity of Deut 6:4–5 was based on a misunderstanding of Joüon's Hebrew grammar. However, his central insight about the date of Deut 6:5 was sound and can be correlated with further evidence from the vocabulary and reception history of Deut 6:4. Thus, the widely held assumption that Deut 6:4 stood at the head of a Josianic book of Deuteronomy and was the slogan of the Josianic reformation is shown to rest upon precarious foundations.

The Date of the *Shema* (Deut 6:4–5)¹

Introduction

In 1805 W.M.L. de Wette argued that the book of Deuteronomy was not only the ספר התורה, “the book of the law,” discovered in Josiah’s reign, but also a pious fraud. The original book of Deuteronomy, *Urdeuteronomium*, was essentially a version of the Covenant Code (Exod 21–23) thoroughly revised in light of the principle of cult centralization.² From the perspective of the

¹ The research for this essay was undertaken as part of the Sofja-Kovalevskaja project on early Jewish monotheisms supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung and the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research. Earlier versions of the paper were given in Göttingen, King’s College London, the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament in Munich and the annual meeting of the SBL in San Diego. I am grateful to everyone who asked questions or made suggestions on those occasions.

² W.M.L. de Wette, “Dissertatio critico-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi Libris diversum, alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur” (University of Jena, 1805); for the Latin text, German translation and discussion see Hans-Peter Mathys, “Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wettes ‘Dissertatio critico-exegetica’ von 1805,” in *Biblische Theologie und historisches Denken: Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Studien aus Anlass der 50. Wiederkehr der Basler Promotion von Rudolf Smend*, ed. Martin Kessler and Martin Wallraff, Studien zur Wissenschaften in Basel 5 (Basel: Schwabe, 2008), 171–211, and for English translation and discussion see P.B. Harvey, Jr. and Baruch Halpern, “W.M.L. de Wette’s ‘*Dissertatio Critica* ...’: Context and Translation”, *ZABR* 14 (2008): 47–85; Reinhard Gregor Kratz, *The*

drafters of the Deuteronomic code, sacrifice and other cultic service to YHWH was only to take place at one sanctuary, which, though never explicitly named, was the Jerusalem temple. De Wette's identification was to have significant implications for the scholarly understanding of the book's literary integrity and not just its date of composition. It is apparent that much of the book's framework is superfluous to the aspirations of the seventh-century reformers. This recognition, together with other indications of the framework's composite nature, has led to considerable industry in an attempt to distinguish *Urdeuteronomium* and its various redactional layers. This has proved to be one of the most demanding tasks in critical scholarship, and continues to call forth fresh and interesting proposals, though none has secured a broad consensus.³

In the early twentieth century the influential argument was made that *Urdeuteronomium* began with Deut 6:4: "Hear O Israel, YHWH our God YHWH one." The theological affirmation grounded the reform agenda of cultic centralization. As there was to be but one God for Israel,

Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament, trans. John Bowden (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 118; Bernard M. Levinson, *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

³ "Daß das Dtn eine komplizierte Entstehungsgeschichte hat, ist offensichtlich. Doch gibt es darüber keine Theorie, die sich durchgesetzt hätte" (Norbert Lohfink, "Deuteronomium," *Neues Bibel-Lexikon* 1: 416). For an account of contemporary scholarship see Eckart Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1–4,43*, HThKAT (Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 62–230.

so also there was to be one cultic place.⁴ Earlier scholarship was convinced that it was possible to reconstruct an original parenthesis from Deut 6–11, particularly through attention to the presence of *Numeruswechsel*. In more recent redaction-criticism confidence has diminished and it is increasingly recognized that a very large part of Deut 6–11 does not come from the hands of the seventh-century reformers.⁵ In a number of recent proposals the only traces of *Urdeuteronomium* prior to Deut 12 are found in Deut 6:4(–5).⁶ When so many aspects of

⁴ Preuss provides a summary of earlier scholarship and numerous bibliographical references. “Da nach Meinung mehrerer Forscher Dtn 6,4–9 sich als alter Text erweisen lassen, wäre in 6,4 der mögliche Anfang des ‘Urdtn.s’ zu sehen, der mit der Betonung der ‘Einheit’ Jahwes gut auf die älteste Schicht von Dtn 12 hingeführt und somit die Forderung nach Kultzentralisation an nur ‘einem’ Kultort gut von der ‘Einheit’ Jahwes her begründet haben könnte” (Horst Dietrich Preuss, *Deuteronomium*, EdF 164 [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982], 100).

⁵ See, e.g., Andrew D.H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SCM, 1983). 22–39; Reinhard Achenbach, *Israel zwischen Verheissung und Gebot: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zu Deuteronomium 5–11*, Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe 23, Theologie 422 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1991), Eduard Nielsen, *Deuteronomium*, HAT I/6 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 69–130; Timo Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose: Deuteronomium*, ATD 8,1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

⁶ Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien*, BZAW, 284 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 361–62; Thomas C. Römer, *The So-Called*

Pentateuchal scholarship have been in flux in recent years, this is a striking point of stability. Nevertheless, I want to examine just how secure the evidence for this consensus is.⁷

Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 59–60, 75; cf. Kratz, *Composition*, 126–33.

⁷ It is to the credit of Raik Heckl that his recent article on the subject does not assume that *Urdeuteronomium* began with Deut 6:4, but seeks to provide arguments for the position (Raik Heckl, “Der ursprüngliche Anfang des Deuteronomiums und seine literarische Transformation”, *ZABR* 20 [2014], 71–96). But the case is not compelling. The weakness of the arguments is hard to disguise, for Heckl begins with the reception of Deut 6:4–9 in the Jewish daily practice of reciting the *Shema*. “Die Dominanz und die Anfangsstellung von Dtn 6,4ff. (bzw. der Deuteronomiumtexte) bereits in der Antike lassen erkennen, dass die Praxis mit dem Deuteronomium und wahrscheinlich auch mit Dtn 6,4 begonnen hat.” (Raik Heckl, “Der ursprüngliche Anfang des Deuteronomiums und seine literarische Transformation”, *ZABR* 20 [2014], 84). But the texts that constitute the *Shema* were chosen because of their reference to recitation, and prove nothing about the original beginning of *Urdeuteronomium*, as Heckl admits. “Ein Beweis dafür, dass Dtn 6,4 am Anfang des Deuteronomiums stand, ist dies zwar nicht, doch eine besondere Bedeutung von Dtn 6,4ff. ist unverkennbar.” (Ibid.). Second, Heckl argues that the superscription in Deut 5:1, שמע ישראל את־החקים ואת־המשפטים, took up and manipulated the original opening in 6:4. But this assumes the relationship between 5:1 and 6:4. Even if were to accept that 5:1 is later than 6:4, this does not prove 6:4 was the original beginning of the *Urdeuteronomium*. Third, Heckl points to the similarity of 6:4–5 to 26:16–17, which he understands as the conclusion of *Urdeuteronomium*. But this relies on the equally

My investigation will proceed in four stages. First, I will examine the important arguments made by Timo Veijola that the love commandment in Deut 6:5 was an interpolation into the *Shema* belonging to a late redactional stratum. I will argue that Veijola's argument about the integrity of Deut 6:4–5 was based on a misunderstanding of Joüon's Hebrew grammar. Second, I will consider the attempt by Eckart Otto to argue that covenant ideas are integral to the Josianic book of Deuteronomy. I will argue that his arguments that 612 BCE marks the *terminus ad quem* for the Urdeuteronomium are not secure. In contrast, Veijola's observations about the striking distribution of the love commandment within the book of Deuteronomy demand an explanation. Third, drawing upon my assessment of the arguments by Veijola and Otto I will demonstrate that there are grounds for doubting the widespread view that Deut 6:4–5 opened *Urdeuteronomium*. The lack of a verbal connection with the centralization commandment and the absence of literary resonances in the earliest levels of Deuteronomy suggest Deut 6:4–5 was introduced into the book after its initial composition. Fourth, I will offer some preliminary proposals about how Deut 5–11 may have developed, if Deut 6:4 was not its original core.

unproven hypothesis that 26:16–19 concluded *Urdeuteronomium*, and that is far from undisputed (Andrew D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, NCBC [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981], 337–39; Nielsen, *Deuteronomium*, 235–42). Fourth, Heckl notes the reception of Deut 6:4–5 in the Deuteronomistic History (Josh 22:5; 1 Kgs 8:48; 2 Kgs 23:3, 25). Yet none of these texts belong to the earliest layer of the Deuteronomistic History: on this point advocates of the Harvard school (attributing them to Dtr²) and the Göttingen school (attributing them to DtrN) could agree.

1. Timo Veijola's Interpretation of the *Shema*

In 1992 Timo Veijola published two essays in which he examined the redaction, the theology and the background of the *Shema*.⁸ In a careful discussion of its translation and interpretation Veijola rejects understanding Deut 6:4 as a statement of mono-Yahwism. The mono-Yahwistic interpretation, which has many supporters, views Deut 6:4 as a rejection of the worship of local manifestations of YHWH at different shrines. Veijola insists that “although this view cannot in principle be dismissed out of hand...it is unlikely in view of the fact that nowhere in Deuteronomy is cult centralization grounded in the nature of “one YHWH” and that this aspect does not emerge anywhere in the biblical reception of Deut 6:4b.⁹ Instead, he argues that Deut

⁸ Timo Veijola, “Höre Israel! Der Sinn und Hintergrund von Deuteronomium VI 4–9,” *VT* 42 (1992): 528–541; Timo Veijola, “Das Bekenntnis Israels: Beobachtungen zur Geschichte und Theologie von Dtn 6,4–9,” *TZ* 48 (1992): 369–381; The essays were published together as Timo Veijola, “Das Bekenntnis Israels: Beobachtungen zu Geschichte und Aussage von Dtn 6,4–9,” in Timo Veijola, *Moses Erben: Studien zum Dekalog, zum Deuteronomismus und zum Schriftgelehrtentum*, BWANT 149 (Kohlhammer, 2000), 76–93.

⁹ “Obwohl diese Sicht grundsätzlich nicht von der Hand zu weisen ist, sondern sogar einen gewissen historischen Anhalt in den Texten von Kuntillet ‘Ağrud...ist sie doch unwahrscheinlich angesichts dessen, daß im Deuteronomium die Kultzentralisation nirgendwo mit dem Wesen des ‘einen Jahwe’ begründet wird und daß dieser Aspekt in den biblischen Wirkungsgeschichte von Dtn 6,4b überhaupt nicht in Erscheinung tritt.” (Veijola, “Das Bekenntnis Israels [2000],” 83).

6:4 should be translated “Hear, O Israel: YHWH is our God, YHWH is unique,” and declared “the commitment to the only true God, which is obligatory for Israel.”¹⁰

With most scholars since Puukko, Veijola views Deut 6:4 as the theological statement that opens *Urdeuteronomium*, but building upon the analysis of García López he argues that it needs an introduction which can be found in 4:45*, 5:1aα*: “^{4:45}These are the statutes and ordinances, which Moses spoke to the Israelites when they came out of Egypt. ^{5:1}Moses assembled all Israel, and he said to them: Hear O Israel, ^{6:4}YHWH is our God, YHWH is unique.” This is then followed by Deut 6:6–9* and the earliest layer of the law of centralization: Deut 12:13–14, 17–18, 21.

Perhaps the most original contribution of Veijola in his essays was his attributing 6:5 to a late deuteronomistic redactor.¹¹ He offered two arguments. First, v. 5 is closely bound to v. 4b thematically and together these verses make a distinct unit. At the same time v. 5 does not belong syntactically to v. 4b. Veijola observes,

It is entirely possible for a perf. cons. to follow a nominal sentence, but in such cases it is usually a statement about the future, in which the perf. cons. presupposes and continues, both chronologically and logically, the participle (normally introduced with a הנה). A grammatical connection of this sort is lacking between v. 4b and v. 5, which would justify the

¹⁰ “Höre Israel: Jahwe ist unser Gott, Jahwe ist einzig...die Bindung an den einzigen wahren Gott, die für Israel verpflichtend ist” (Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose*, 178–79).

¹¹ See also U. Rüterswörden, *Deuteronomium*, NSKAT 5 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2006), 51–52.

consecutio part. plus perf. cons. Verse 4b contains a timeless statement, which on a syntactic level cannot be continued by the following perf. cons. ואהבת “and you shall love.”¹²

Rather, v. 5 belongs to the series of perfect consecutives that continue the imperative שמע of v. 4a. Further confirmation of this is provided by the second person singular which is appropriate since Israel is the subject of v. 4a. As such v. 5 belongs syntactically to the series of perfect consecutives in vv. 6–9, and not to v. 4b. This results in the problematic situation that v. 5 is both an element of the instructions for practice *and* part of the content to be remembered. Thus, the instructions in vv. 6–9 about “these words” (v. 6) cannot originally have included v. 5, but only v. 4b. Second, Veijola observed that the demand to love YHWH and the expression “with all your heart and all your soul” only occurred in deuteronomistic texts. Were Deut 6:5 to be attributed to *Urdeuteronomium*, it is rather puzzling that it shows no discernible impact anywhere else in deuteronomic material. “In light of this finding, the question arises as to whether Deut 6:5 would not have left earlier verbal traces in the deuteronomistic literature, if the demand to love YHWH with all your heart, all your soul and all your strength had constituted the

¹² “Es ist zwar durchaus möglich, daß einem Nominalsatz ein Perf. Cons. folgt, aber in dem Fall handelt es sich in der Regel um eine futurische Aussage, wobei das Perf. cons. das – gewöhnlich durch הנה eingeleitete – Partizip in zeitlicher und logischer Hinsicht voraussetzt und fortsetzt. Zwischen V. 4b und V. 5 fehlt jedoch eine grammatische Verbindung dieser Art, die die consecutio Part. + Perf. cons. rechtfertigen würde. Vers 4b enthält eine zeitlose Aussage, die auf der syntaktischen Ebene nicht von dem nachfolgenden Perf. cons. ואהבת “und du sollst lieben” fortgesetzt wird.” (Veijola, “Das Bekenntnis Israels [2000],” 80).

solemn overture of the original Deuteronomy.”¹³ In further support of Veijola’s contention it could be argued that, if anything, the threefold form makes more sense as an emphatic development of the twofold form, “all your heart and all your soul.” It would be more logical if this were the end point, rather the source of development.

Veijola named the deuteronomistic redaction, to which he attributed v. 5, the covenant theology redaction (*Bundestheologische Redaktion*, or DtrB). In a number of studies, and finally in his regrettably unfinished commentary, he developed his understanding of this redaction.¹⁴ This redactional level has a distinctive theology that emphasizes Israel’s relationship with YHWH as covenantal. The possession of the land promised to the patriarchs depends upon obedience to the commandments, most especially the prohibition of following other deities. The exclusive relationship to the covenantal overlord is to be both internalized and policed externally. Thus,

¹³ “Angesichts dieses Befundes stellt sich die Frage, ob Dtn 6,5 nicht schon früher wörtliche Spuren in der dtr Literatur hinterlassen hätte, wenn die Forderung, Jahwe mit ganzen Herzen, ganzer Seele und ganzer Kraft zu lieben, die feierliche Ouvertüre des ursprünglichen Deuteronomiums gebildet hätte” (Ibid., 81).

¹⁴ Timo Veijola, “‘Der Mensch lebt nicht vom Brot allein’: Zur literarischen Schichtung und theologischen Aussage von Deuteronomium 8,” in Veijola, *Moses Erben*, 153–75; Timo Veijola, “Wahrheit und Intoleranz nach Deuteronomium 13,” in Veijola, *Moses Erben*, 109–30; Timo Veijola, “Bundestheologische Redaktion im Deuteronomium,” in Veijola, *Moses Erben*, 153–75; Timo Veijola, “Bundestheologie in Dtn 10,12–11,30,” in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium*, ed. Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann, FRLANT 190 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 206–21; Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose*.

the individual heart and intention must be orientated to YHWH alone and rebellion against YHWH must be violently suppressed.

Veijola's interpretation of the *Shema* makes a significant contribution to our understanding of Deut 6:4. Most particularly, his analysis of this *Bundestheologische Redaktion* raises significant questions for how deeply embedded covenant conceptuality is within the book of Deuteronomy, even if his proposal about a distinctive redactional level is not followed. Despite its significance, Veijola's argument has a number of critical flaws.

First, it proves difficult to distinguish between Veijola's interpretation of Deut 6:4 and later covenant theology. According to Veijola, "Of course, the nominal sentence 'YHWH is unique' should not be understood in the sense of an absolute monotheism, but in light of the preceding parallel statement ('YHWH is our God') it simply means that YHWH is to be *our* only God."¹⁵ But it is precisely this exclusive relationship that underlies the later *Bundestheologische Redaktion* and justifies its intolerance towards any rebellion (Deut 13, 28). It is comparable to statements found in Assyrian treaty documents which insist on the loyalty of subjects to the Assyrian king, e.g., "from this day on [for as long as we live we will be subjects of Assurbanipal, king of Assyria], (that) Assurbanipal, king of Assyria [shall be our king and lord, and (that) we will be totally devoted] to Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, our lord."¹⁶ The difficulties are apparent when

¹⁵ "Der Nominalsatz 'Jahwe ist einzig' will natürlich nicht im Sinne des absoluten Monotheismus verstanden werden, sondern im Horizont der vorangehenden, parallelen Aussage ('Jahwe ist unser Gott') schlicht besagen, daß Jahwe *unser* einziger Gott sei." (Veijola, "Das Bekenntnis Israel [2000]," 85).

¹⁶ SAA II 9 3'-5'; see also SAA II 6 195, 301; II 33.

Veijola admits, what many others have observed, that there is a close conceptual relationship between vv. 4 and 5.¹⁷ Veijola speaks of a “undeniable connection that exists on the *conceptual* level.”¹⁸ But the main criterion for identifying the *Bundestheologische Redaktion* is its conceptual distinctiveness. On what basis, then, should Deut 6:4 be excluded from the *Bundestheologische Redaktion*?

Second, it is unclear what the purpose of Deut 6:4 is in opening *Urdeuteronomium*. Veijola juxtaposes Deut 6:4, 6–9* with 12:13–21*, but severs the link between the *Shema* and cult centralization. In earlier critical scholarship it was the assumed link between the uniqueness of YHWH and the uniqueness of the sanctuary (one God, one cultic place) that made the *Shema* so convincing as the proposed opening of *Urdeuteronomium*. As classically understood, the principal theme of *Urdeuteronomium*, which colours every part, is cult centralization, and the pithy formula of the *Shema* provided the ideal summary of the book’s key idea. For Veijola the *Shema* no longer has this role, and its appearance in *Urdeuteronomium* is rendered inexplicable.

¹⁷ See, *inter alia*, Eduard Nielsen, “‘Weil Jahwe unser Gott ein Jahwe ist’ (Dtn 6,4f.),’ in *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie*, ed. H. Donner *et al.* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 288–301; W. Herrmann, “Jahwe und des Menschen Liebe zu ihm zu Dtn. VI 4,” *VT* 50 (2000): 47–54.

¹⁸ “Unbestreitbaren Verbindung, die auf der *gedanklichen* Ebene besteht” (Veijola, “Das Bekenntnis Israels [2000],” 80). Veijola also writes, “Der Zusammenhang wird auf der gedanklichen Ebene gesehen: Dem einen bzw. einzigartigen Jahwe entspreche eine umfassende Liebe, die emphatisch durch die dreifache Wiederholung von לַיְהוָה zum Ausdruck gebracht werde” (*Ibid.*).

Third, a crucial part of Veijola's case for attributing v. 5 to a later hand is fundamentally flawed. As Veijola presents things, almost the only nominal sentences that are followed by the perfect consecutive are statements about the future with a participle. He appeals to Joüon's Hebrew grammar §119n at this point,¹⁹ but in this paragraph Joüon addresses only cases of the participle followed by *wəqatalti*. Other types of nominal sentences followed by *wəqatalti* are not discussed, but Joüon should not be read to imply that other examples do not exist, not least because many do. In their *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* Waltke and O'Connor draw attention to a number of different nominal sentences followed by the perfect consecutive. "The *wəqatalti* form after nominal clauses shows the same range of meanings as after suffix-conjugation forms: it is found in the apodosis after a conditional clause; in a consequent situation, which may be volitional; or with an imperfective sense."²⁰ A comparable example to Deut 6:4–5 would be Ruth 3:9: ותאמר אנכי רות אמתך ופרשת כנפך עלי־אמתך. Here, as in the *Shema* a

¹⁹ Veijola, "Das Bekenntnis Israels (2000)," 80.

²⁰ *IBHS*, §32.2.4a. Veijola's misstatement is all the more surprising given that he had read de Boer's article on Deut 6:4–5. De Boer asks precisely the same question as Veijola: "can verses 4b and 5 belong together in line with known Hebrew syntax?" But De Boer rightly answers, "if we take verse 4b as a nominal sentence, the answer is in the affirmative, for it is not unusual to continue such a sentence with *waw perfect*" (P.A.H. de Boer, "Some Observations on Deuteronomy vi 4 and 5," in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. Dr. J. P. M. van der Ploeg zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 4. Juli 1979*, ed. W.C. Delsman et al., AOAT 211 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982], 48).

nominal sentence of identification is followed by a perfect consecutive with a volitional meaning and a different subject.

Without the syntactic argument, the other features Veijola points to in order to substantiate his position lack any persuasive force. The shift from first person plural to second person singular, for example, can be explained in a number of ways. It has often been taken as an indication that we have the incorporation of an existing slogan in v. 4b.²¹ It could be no more than a formal feature, distinguishing the creedal form in v. 4b from the commandment in v. 5. A similar pattern can be observed in 26:1–11 where the Israelite farmer's confession is in the first person

²¹ For Deut 6:4b as pre-existent formula, see Erik Aurelius, "Der Ursprung des Ersten Gebots," *ZThK* 100 (2003): 7; Christoph Levin, "Über den 'Color Hieremianus' des Deuteronomiums," in *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen*, ed. Timo Veijola, *Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft* 62 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 117. I shall not consider the murky question of the prehistory of Deut 6:4. Loretz and Smith argue that its background is to be sought in the kingship of one God above the other deities (Oswald Loretz, *Des Gottes Einzigkeit: ein altorientalisches Argumentationsmodell zum "Schma Jisrael"* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997]; Oswald Loretz, "Die Einzigkeit eines Gottes im Polytheismus von Ugarit: Zur Levante als Ursprungsort des biblischen Monotheismus," in *Polytheismus und Monotheismus in den Religionen des Vorderen Orients*, ed. Manfred Krebernik and Jürgen van Oorschot, *AOAT* 298 [Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002], 71–89; Mark S. Smith, *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-cultural Discourse in the Biblical World*, *FAT* 57 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 143–46).

plural (vv. 5–9), and the instructions about the offering are in the second person singular (vv. 1–4, 10–11).

Fourth, Veijola is inconsistent in identifying later elements. He rightly observes that the demand to love YHWH is found in late additions to *Urdeuteronomium* or in the frame of the book, but failed to observe that the same could also be said of the elements of Deut 6:4. This is a matter to which we will return.

2. The *Shema* and Covenant Theology

The place where Veijola's analysis does not, in my view, demand any critique is in his identification of the love commandment as a relatively late element in the book of Deuteronomy. Veijola's position has not, however, escaped criticism on this score. In particular, Veijola's conclusions about the command to love YHWH and the centrality of covenant theology to the book of Deuteronomy stand in sharp contrast to the position taken by Eckart Otto. In Otto's view *Urdeuteronomium* is to be found in Deut 13* and 28* and was composed as a subversion of the neo-Assyrian loyalty oath. Elements of the loyalty oath to Esarhaddon were transformed into a pledge of loyalty to YHWH. The composition of Esarhaddon's loyalty oath and the end of neo-Assyrian hegemony in the Near East mark respectively the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* for *Urdeuteronomium*. Against Veijola, Otto defends the integrity of Deut 6:4–5,²² and sees the command to love as a characteristic motif of the neo-Assyrian loyalty

²² Otto argues that “die von T. Veijola beobachtete Besonderheit in der Anknüpfung an V.5 erklärt sich ausreichend damit, daß V.4b eine vorgeformte Bekenntnisformel ist, grammatisch sich V.5 durchaus auf V.4a bezieht und ein Sollen ausdrückt, inhaltlich aber V.5 direkt an V.4b

oath.²³ For Otto, then, the love commandment is a significant constituent of the Josianic book of Deuteronomy. “As the opening of the Deuteronomic reform program, Deut 6:4-5 tightly dovetails with the fundamental commandment about cult centralization (Deut 12:13–27*) and the demand for loyalty (Deut 13:2–12*).”²⁴ Literarily, the insistence on Israel’s loyalty forms a bracket around the characteristic commandment of the earliest version of Deuteronomy, cult centralization. As a result, the love commandment cannot have originated in any later layer of the book of Deuteronomy.

Otto’s insistence on a seventh-century date for Deuteronomy’s covenant theology has itself been criticised. Crucial to Otto’s argument is his view that the loyalty oath died out with the collapse of the neo-Assyrian empire. But the lack of extant neo-Babylonian treaties cannot be taken as evidence that they did not exist, or that neo-Assyrian exemplars were not part of the Mesopotamian scribal curriculum in later periods.²⁵ Watanabe lists 230 appearances of *adê* in anknüpft” (Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* [1999], 361–62). Because Otto does not attribute vv. 6–9 to *Urdeuteronomium*, he does not have the same problem as Veijola does that v. 5 syntactically belongs to vv. 6–9, but, in terms of its content, to what precedes.

²³ Ibid., 361.

²⁴ “Dtn 6,4–5 ist als Eröffnung des dtn Reformprogramms eng mit dem Hauptgesetz der Kultzentralisation (Dtn 12,13–27*) und der Loyalitätsforderung (Dtn 13,2–12*) verzahnt.” (Ibid., 362).

²⁵ Steven W. Holloway, “Review of E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien* (BZAW, 284; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999),” *JNES* 66 (2007): 205–8. The perdurance of the treaty form from the second into the first millennium and its

cuneiform, 41 of which come from the neo-Babylonian and Persian periods.²⁶ In addition, Weisberg notes a number of similarities between the loyalty oaths binding craftsmen in Early Achaemenid Babylonia and earlier neo-Assyrian loyalty oaths.²⁷ The recent discovery of Esarhaddon's loyalty oath at Tell Tayinat provides new insight into the Assyrian employment of loyalty oaths in Syro-Palestine,²⁸ and increases the likelihood that a loyalty oath was imposed on Manasseh.²⁹ Nevertheless, the similarities of Deuteronomy 13 and 28 to Esarhaddon's loyalty

geographical spread points to its political utility for ancient Near Eastern states, and it seems unlikely that it should have fallen into disuse after 612 BCE.

²⁶ K. Watanbe, *Die adê-Vereidigung anlässlich der Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons*, *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 3 (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1987), 9–23. I have not included places where *adê* occurs in personal names or in a fragmentary context.

²⁷ D. B. Weisberg, *Guild Structure and Political Allegiance in Early Achaemenid Mesopotamia*, *Yale Near Eastern Researches* 1 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), 32–42. According to Ezek 17.13 Nebuchadnezzar made a covenant with Zedekiah after the removal of his father Jehoiachin (v. 12).

²⁸ For the text and discussion, see Jacob Lauinger, "Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty at Tell Tayinat: Text and Commentary," *JCS* 64 (2012): 87–123; Hans U. Steymans, "Deuteronomy 28 and Tell Tayinat," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34 (2013), doi:10.4102/ve.v34i2.870.

²⁹ Christoph Koch, on the other hand, suggests that the similarities between Deuteronomy and Esarhaddon's loyalty oath may be the result of a North-West Semitic treaty tradition, rather than evidence that one specific set of neo-Assyrian treaties formed the exclusive model for *Urdeuteronomium*. He draws attention to Aramean treaties such as Sefire, and suggests that

oath provide no more than a *terminus a quo*; we have almost no evidence of how the loyalty oath may have been transmitted or appropriated in the Syro-Palestine region.

If arguments for 612 BCE as a *terminus ad quem* for *Urdeuteronomium* are rather vulnerable, the same is less true of Veijola's examination of the love commandment. Veijola's arguments are based on the striking distribution of the love commandment within the book of Deuteronomy. The command to love YHWH is only otherwise found in Deut 10–11, 19 and 30,³⁰ whilst the expression “heart and soul” is restricted to Deut 4, 10–11, 13, 26 and 30.³¹ None of these texts belong to *Urdeuteronomium*, and there is considerable agreement that they belong to some of

these might have been the means by which the treaty traditions were mediated to Israel rather than through encounter with the Loyalty Oath of Esarhaddon (Christoph Koch, *Vertrag, Treueid und Bund: Studien zur Rezeption des altorientalischen Vertragsrechts im Deuteronomium und zur Ausbildung der Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*, BZAW 383 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008]). Koch rejects the arguments of those who see particularly strong parallels between Esarhaddon's Loyalty Oath and Deuteronomy 13 and 28 (Hans Ulrich Steymans, *Deuteronomium 28 und die adê zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons: Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*, OBO, 145 [Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1995]; Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* (1999), 15–90; Bernard M. Levinson and Jeffrey Stackert. “Between the Covenant Code and Esarhaddon's Succession Treaty: Deuteronomy 13 and the Composition of Deuteronomy,” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 3 [2012]: 123–40).

³⁰ Deut 10:12; 11:1, 13, 22; 19:9; 30:6, 16, 20.

³¹ Deut 4:29; 10:12; 11:13, 18; 13:4; 26:16; 30:2, 6, 10.

the latest levels within Deuteronomy.³² The earliest reference to loving YHWH in Deuteronomy is probably to be found in the Decalogue, where its meaning is clearly explicated as entailing

³² As we have already seen Veijola would attribute these occurrences to his DtrB. It should be noted, however, that there is some overlap between his DtrB and Mayes' "late deuteronomistic author" (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*; Veijola, *Das fünfte Buch Mose*). Deut 4:1–40 and 29:1–30:10 are closely related and usually attributed to the same hand. Deut 4 concludes the first Mosaic speech and is dependent upon – and usually considered later than – Deut 1–3. Deut 1–3, itself, is part of a late framing of the book, either as the introduction to a Deuteronomistic History (so Noth) or as a bridge to the Tetrateuch (so Otto). For the late deuteronomistic date of these chapters, see, *inter alia*, E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumsrahmens*, FAT 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Jon D. Levenson, "Who Inserted the Book of the Torah?," *HTR* 68 (1975): 203–33; Georg Braulik, *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik: Erhoben aus Deuteronomium 4,1–40*, AnBib 68 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978); Georg Braulik, "Literarkritik und die Einrahmung von Gemälden: Zur literarkritischen und redaktionsgeschichtlichen Analyse von Dtn 4,1–6,3 und 29,1–30,10 durch D. Knapp," *RB* 96 (1989): 266–88; Andrew D. H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy 4 and the Literary Criticism of Deuteronomy," *JBL* 100 (1981): 23–51. Deut 10:12–11:32 concludes the parenesis of Deut 5–11 and appears to be something of a pastiche including material from early chapters. For these chapters see, *inter alia*, Veijola, "Bundestheologie"; Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 207–19; Eckart Otto, "Deuteronomiumstudien II: Deuteronomistische und postdeuteronomistische Perspektiven in der Literaturgeschichte von Deuteronomium 5–11," *ZABR* 15 (2009): 210–13. The love commandment in Deut 13:4 occurs in a plural section (13:4b–5), which would ordinarily

obedience: “those who love me and keep my commandments” (5:10; cf. 7:9). Thus, despite the widespread assumption that 6:5 was part of the programmatic introduction to *Urdeuteronomium*, there is no evidence that the verse had an influence upon either *Urdeuteronomium* or even the

exclude it from *Urdeuteronomium*. Although Dion and Veijola have argued that no part of Deut 13 is as early as *Urdeuteronomium* (Paul-Eugène Dion, “Deuteronomy 13: The Suppression of Alien Religious Propaganda in Israel during the Late Monarchic Era,” in *Law and Ideology in Monarchic Israel*, ed. Baruch Halpern and D.W. Hobson, JSOTSup 124 [Sheffield: JSOT, 1991], 147–216; Veijola, “Wahrheit”), the place of Deuteronomy 13 in *Urdeuteronomium* is greatly disputed in contemporary scholarship (see, e.g., Levinson and Stackert, “Between the Covenant Code”; Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* [1999], 15–90). Nevertheless, those who argue Deut 13 is deuteronomic exclude vv. 4b–5 as a later addition (Eckart Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* [1999], 39–40; cf. Bernard M. Levinson, “Textual Criticism, Assyriology, and the History of Interpretation: Deuteronomy 13:7a as a Test Case in Method,” *JBL* 120 [2001]: 239), and Dion’s detailed arguments for the deuteronomistic origins of vv. 4b–5 are compelling (Dion, “Deuteronomy 13,” 168–72, 177–88; see also Koch, *Vertrag*, 116–20). Deut 19:8–10 contains deuteronomistic ideas such as the gift of the land to the fathers, and the additional three cities of refuge presupposes the conquest of Transjordan described in Deut 1–3. For these verses see, *inter alia*, Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 287; Eckart Otto, “Aspects of Legal Reforms and Reformulations,” in *Theory and Method in Biblical and Cuneiform Law: Revision, Interpretation and Development*, ed. Bernard Levinson (JSOTSup 181; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 195; Nielsen, *Deuteronomium*, 187–90. Deut 26:16 provides a transition between the end of the Deuteronomic law and the covenant formula (26:17–19). Its vocabulary and ideas have been identified as deuteronomistic, see, *inter alia*, Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 338.

earliest redactional layers. Thus, Veijola's contention that Deut 6:5 was not part of *Urdeuteronomium*, but a relatively late arrival, has some justification.

3. The *Shema* and *Urdeuteronomium*

To this point I have demonstrated two things. First, Veijola was correct to attribute the love commandment to relatively late deuteronomistic strata. Second, there are not sufficient grounds for detaching Deut 6:5 from the surrounding verses. The only reasonable conclusion to draw from these two observations is that 6:4–5 is a relatively late addition to the book of Deuteronomy. Yet, as we have seen, this pushes against the consensus within Old Testament scholarship that Deut 6:4 was an integral part of *Urdeuteronomium* and a theological slogan of the Deuteronomic agenda.

The main argument in favour of the *Shema* as part of *Urdeuteronomium* is the apparent congruence between the affirmation of YHWH as one and the programme of centralization. The oneness of God provided the theological basis for cult centralization: one God worshipped in one sanctuary. In some recent reconstructions of *Urdeuteronomium*, the *Shema* immediately precedes the command to centralize worship (12:13ff.). Otto draws attention to the close literary connection.

The threefold יְהוָה יְהוָה in Deut 6:5 functions as a prelude to the numerous appearances of יְהוָה יְהוָה in the commandment about cult centralization (Deut 12:3, 15[x2], 18, 20, 21). יְהוָה יְהוָה in Deut 6:5 is resumed by יְהוָה יְהוָה in Deut 12:15, 20. Above all, however, Deut 6:4–5 and Deut 12:13–27* are connected by the common theme of one God and the one

cult place: *YHWH, so says the creed, is unique, and he has chosen, so says the centralization commandment, one unique cult place.*³³

Thus, the Josianic book of Deuteronomy opened in the following manner:

Hear, O Israel, YHWH, our god, YHWH is one (אחד). So you shall love YHWH your god with all (בכל) your heart, with all your (בכל) soul and with all (בכל) your might. Take care that you do not offer your burnt offerings at any (בכל) place you happen to see. But only at the place that YHWH will chose in one (באחד) of your tribes. There you shall offer your burnt offerings and there you shall do all (כל) that I command you.³⁴

³³ “Das dreimalige בָּכֶל־ in Dtn 6,5 präludiert das mehrfache בָּכֶל־ in den Zentralisationsgesetzen (Dtn 12,3.15[2x].18.20.21). בָּכֶל־נִפְשָׁךְ in Dtn 6,5 wird durch בָּכֶל־אַיִת נִפְשָׁךְ in Dtn 12,15.20 wieder aufgenommen. Vor allem aber sind Dtn 6,4f. und Dtn 12, 13–27* durch das gemeinsame Thema des einen Gottes und des einen Kultortes miteinander verbunden: *JHWH, so sagt es das Bekenntnis, ist einzig, und, so sagen die Zentralisierungsgesetze, einen einzigen Kultort hat er erwählt.*” (Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* [1999], 363–64). Italics original.

³⁴ This translation and reconstruction of the text is taken from Thomas Römer, “Cult Centralization in Deuteronomy 12: Between Deuteronomistic History and Pentateuch,” in *Das Deuteronomium zwischen Pentateuch und Deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk*, ed. Eckart Otto and Reinhard Achenbach, FRLANT 206 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 170.

The critical problem, as Veijola has identified, is that אֶחָד is not used as a slogan within the book of Deuteronomy.³⁵ This point is not diminished by the juxtaposition of Deut 6:4–5 and 12:13ff., for the resulting catchwords – כָּל and אֶחָד – do not make a compelling argument for a close literary relationship. First, כָּל is far too common an expression – occurring no less than sixty-three times in Deuteronomy alone – to claim a deliberate close relationship between Deut 6:4–5 and Deut 12:13–14. In addition, the expression is used in contrasting ways in the two passages. It describes the wholehearted commitment of the Israelites and the numerous cultic sites that they are *not* to frequent. Secondly, the use of אֶחָד in 12:14 is not in a rhetorically prominent position, nor is the expression “one of your tribes” found anywhere else in Deuteronomy. If Deut 6:4 was the slogan of the deuteronomic theological vision, it is difficult to explain the lack of prominence given to אֶחָד in *Urdeuteronomium*. Instead, Deuteronomy insists not that people and sanctuary are “one,” but that they are “chosen” (בָּחַר).³⁶

An examination of the distribution of lexemes in Deuteronomy provides further confirmation that Deut 6:4–9 was not part of *Urdeuteronomium*. As we have already seen Veijola demonstrated that the command to love YHWH and the expression “heart and soul” are only to be

³⁵ It might be suspected that the political slogans of modern Europe, e.g. *ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Gott* or *un roi, une loi, une foi* have inadvertently been introduced into the interpretation of Deuteronomy.

³⁶ Thus, if there is any relationship to the affirmation that “YHWH is one,” it is one of contrast. “Chosen” suggests a dependent relationship upon YHWH, to whom alone the predication “one” is applied. Similarly, N. MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of “Monotheism”*, FAT II/1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 216.

found in deuteronomistic layers. But the same is also true of elements that are characteristic of v. 4. The term “Israel” יִשְׂרָאֵל is not found in any of the laws that concern centralization and are definitively associated with *Urdeuteronomium*,³⁷ and יִשְׂרָאֵל as a form of address is only otherwise found in Deut 5:1; 6:3; 9:1; 10:12; 20:3; 27:9. There are grounds for thinking all of them are at least deuteronomistic.³⁸ Similarly, Moses’ identification with the people by means of

³⁷ Within the Deuteronomic lawcode יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs at Deut 13:12; 17:4, 12, 20; 18:1, 6; 19:13; 20:3; 21:8, 21; 22:19, 21; 23:18; 24:7; 25:6.

³⁸ Deut 5:1aβ, b is an addition that is indebted to the late deuteronomistic Deut 4. It focuses attention on the statutes and ordinances that follow in Deut 12, rather than the immediate concern with the Decalogue (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 165; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, BKAT V/1 [Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2013], 414; Otto attributes it to his DtrD [*Deuteronomium* 4,44–11,32, HThKAT (Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 667–684]). Deut 6:3 is part of the transition between the Decalogue and the *Shema* and is not to be dated earlier than either. The phraseology in 6:2–3 is again indebted to Deut 4 (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 174; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium*, 442–44). Deut 9:1 is part of a repurposing of the Golden Calf story, and is no earlier than that narrative. It is part of a small pericope (vv. 1–3) that is indebted to the deuteronomistic narrative in Deut 1–3, in particular 1:28 (Achenbach, *Israel zwischen Verheissung und Gebot*, 335–344; Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot*, 200–206). Deut 10:12 is part of the extended parenesis attached to the story of the Golden Calf, which is widely identified as a late deuteronomistic insertion with a close relationship to Deut 4 (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 207–8; Timo Veijola, “Bundestheologie in Dtn 10,12–11,30,” in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium*, ed. Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann, FRLANT 190 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

the first person plural or the use of the first person plural in creedal statements is common in Deut 1–4; 5; 6 and 29.³⁹ These are mostly, if not entirely, deuteronomistic.⁴⁰ Though it can be

Deut 20:3 is usually identified as part of a secondary intrusion (vv. 2–4) into a law concerning warfare (20:1–9). Its secondary nature is indicated by the second person plural, the reference to priests rather than officials, and its apparent contradiction and partial duplication of v. 8 (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 292–93). Deut 27:9 is part of chapter that is widely recognized as disruptive. It is possible that vv. 9–10 were part of the original core of the chapter and followed immediately after 26:16–19 with which they are closely linked as a secondary extension (Richard Nelson, *Deuteronomy*, OTL [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002], 315).

³⁹ Deut 1:6, 19–20, 22, 25, 27–28, 41; 2:1, 8, 13–14, 29–30, 32–37; 3:1, 3–4, 6–8, 12, 29; 4:7; 5:2–3, 24–27; 6:4, 20–25; 9:28; 12:8; 26:3, 7–8, 15; 29:7–8, 14, 16, 29.

⁴⁰ Since Noth it has been recognized that Deut 1–3 are deuteronomistic (Martin Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History*, JSOTSup, 15 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981]). Deut 4 was composed no earlier, and possibly later than Deut 1–3 (Eckart Otto, “Deuteronomium 4: Die Pentateuchredaktion im Deuteronomiumsrahmen,” in *Das Deuteronomium und seine Querbeziehungen*, ed. Timo Veijola, Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft, 62 [Helsinki: Finnische Exegetische Gesellschaft, 1996], 196–222; D. Knapp, *Deuteronomium 4: Literarische Analyse und theologische Interpretation*, GTA, 35 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1987]). Deut 5:2–3, 24–27 are part of the narrative account of the giving of the Decalogue, which is itself later than *Urdeuteronomium* as has already been observed. It is possible that 5:2–3 is an addition to the chapter (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 165), though this is disputed (Otto, *Deuteronomium 4*, 44–11, 32, 667–84). Deut 5:24–27 is not straightforward, and

argued, as has just been observed, that Deut 6:4b was a pre-existent formula, this does not explain the lack of influence of the first person plural in the earliest revisions of *Urdeuteronomium*.

The picture from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible is consistent with a later appearance of the *Shema*, even if the evidence is only circumstantial. Thus, despite the view that the *Shema*

has probably been expanded in a process of *Fortschreibung* (cf. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 172–73). Deut 9:28 belongs to the rehearsal of the Golden Calf story. The original calf story is probably to be found in 9:9–21 and the intercession in 9:26–29 is a secondary expansion (Otto, *Deuteronomium* 4,44–11,32, 943–69). Deut 12:8 belongs to what is usually identified as a deuteronomistic expansion of the centralization commandment (12:8–12) (Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 61–63). Though the “creed” that accompanies the presentation of the firstfruits in 26:5–9 was long considered an early statement of Israelite faith, recent scholarship has shown that it is a late construction that presupposes many parts of the Pentateuchal narrative (Jan Christian Gertz, “Die Stellung des kleinen geschichtlichen Credo in der Redaktionsgeschichte von Deuteronomium und Pentateuch,” in *Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium*, ed. Reinhard Gregor Kratz and Hermann Spieckermann, FRLANT, 190 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 30–45). The ceremony for the offering of the triennial tithe in 26:12–15 takes up themes from 26:1–11, and shows other evidence of deuteronomistic editing (Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, 335–37). Deut 29:1–30:10 is in a close relationship to Deut 1–3 (4) and should likewise be attributed to a deuteronomistic writer (Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* [2000]).

opened *Urdeuteronomium* and was a popular slogan for the seventh century reform movement,⁴¹ the expression “YHWH is one” never appears in the history from Joshua to 2 Kings. As Lohfink observes, “there are many keywords in the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic vocabulary which are often repeated in this material, but *yhvh ’elohenu yhvh ’echadh*, ‘Yahweh our God, Yahweh is unique’, is not one of these.”⁴² The preferred form of monotheistic affirmation is “YHWH is God (האלהים),” or something similar.⁴³ It might be argued that we only find “YHWH is God” because it was a more adequate statement of monotheism than Deut 6:4, which is no more than a monolatrous affirmation. Not only does this credit the ancient writers with the subtlety of our modern distinctions, but it also does not explain why the statement “YHWH is one” was retained in Deut 6 and not elsewhere. Echoes of the *Shema* only begin to appear in texts from a much

⁴¹ Albertz, for example, argues “‘Hear, Israel, Yahweh, our God, Yahweh is one’ (Deut 6.4) was the reform slogan which was hammered home to the population time and again in public pronouncement (cf. 20.2).” (Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*, OTL [Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1994], 206). It is very difficult to see how the assertion that it was “hammered home...time and again” is derived from the historical evidence available.

⁴² Norbert Lohfink and J. Bergmann, “*יְהוָה יֶחָאֵד*,” *TDOT* 1:196.

⁴³ Deut 4:35, 39; 7:9; 2 Sam 7:28; 1 Kgs 8:60; 18:37, 39; 2 Kgs 19:15, 19 (cf. Josh 2:11; 2 Kgs 5:15). For a discussion of the monotheistic statements in the deuteronomistic history see Juha Pakkala, *Intolerant Monolatry in the Deuteronomistic History*, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999); Juha Pakkala, “The Monotheism of the Deuteronomistic History,” *SJOT* 21 (2007): 159–78.

later period. In Zech 14:9 the realization of the *Shema* is projected into the eschatological future: “YHWH will be one” (יהיה יהוה אחד), whilst Malachi justifies his position on marriage by appeal to the “one God who created us” (הלל אל אחד בראנו; 2:10). The growing significance of the *Shema* in late biblical texts highlights its absence in earlier Israelite literature.⁴⁴

It is here in the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Deuteronomy that a theology of the “one” first clearly begins to be developed, but it is only in the later Second Temple period that a connection between one God and one Temple is explicitly articulated. Philo writes, “since God is one, there should be also only one temple.”⁴⁵ In the *Antiquities* Josephus rephrases the beginning of the Deuteronomic law in the following manner: “Let there be, in the fairest part of the land of the Chananaians, one holy city (ἱερὰ πόλις ἔστω μία) that is renowned for its excellence, whichever God selects for Himself through prophecy; and let there be one Temple (νεὸς εἷς) in it and one altar of stones (βωμὸς εἷς ἐκ λίθων) that are not hewn but chosen and joined together, which, smeared with whitewash, will be appealing and clean to view. Let the access to this be not by steps but by a sloping ramp. In another city let there be neither an altar nor a temple, for God is one and the stock of the Hebrews one (θεὸς γὰρ εἷς καὶ τὸ Ἑβραίων γένος ἓν).”⁴⁶ Its appearance

⁴⁴ See Nathan MacDonald, “The Beginnings of One-ness Theology in Late Israelite Prophetic Literature,” in *Monotheism in Late Prophetic and Early Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. Nathan MacDonald and Ken Brown, FAT II/72 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 103–23.

⁴⁵ *Spec. Leg.* 1.67; translation according to F. H. Colson, *Philo VII*, LCL, 320 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937), 138–139.

⁴⁶ *Antiquities* 4.200–201; translation according to Louis H. Feldman, *Flavius Josephus, Judean Antiquities 1–4*, Flavius Josephus 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 398–400.

at this point may owe something to the Greco-Roman environment. As Guerra observes this kind of theology provided Jewish apologists with “a bridge between their religion and the growing theological consensus of the contemporary educated gentile of the Hellenistic period.”⁴⁷ In summary, the reception history is consistent with the *Shema*’s relatively late appearance, and it undermines the significance that scholars have argued that the *Shema* had in the pre-exilic period. The importance of the *Shema* only emerged during the course of the Second Temple period.

4. The Growth of Deuteronomy 5–11

To this point I have argued that the *Shema* should not be seen as the earliest introduction to *Urdeuteronomium*, but as a relatively late entrant into the book of Deuteronomy. Clearly this will have significant implications for understanding the development of Deut 5–11. For a long time scholars have seen Deut 6:4–5 as the seed from which the parenetical framework grows. Deuteronomy 5–11 is an exegetical exposition of *das Hauptgebot*.⁴⁸ Christoph Levin puts the matter elegantly: “without Deut 6:4–5, everything else hangs in the air.”⁴⁹ Our proposal would clearly require extensive analysis beyond what is possible in this paper, and so what I hope to show is that Levin’s comment is unduly dramatic.

⁴⁷ Anthony J. Guerra, *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition: The Purpose, Genre, and Audience of Paul’s Letter*, SNTSMS 81 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 94.

⁴⁸ Norbert Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5–11* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963).

⁴⁹ “Ohne Dtn 6,4–5 hinge alles weitere in der Luft” (Levin, “Color Hieremianus,” 117).

Levin's claim does point to the fact that some passages within Deut 5–11 are dependent on Deut 6:4–5. The clearest example is probably the instructions about repeating and displaying the words of Moses in 11:18–20. These echo the instructions in 6:6–9, which are themselves logically dependent on 6:4–5. Two observations suggest that 11:18–20 is later.⁵⁰ First, whilst “these words” probably refers to 6:4 or 6:4–5,⁵¹ which could feasibly be written upon amulets and upon gates, “these words of mine” in 11:18 have no obvious referent, and may refer to the whole of the Deuteronomic law.⁵² It would appear, then, that the concrete instructions in 6:6–9 have been given a metaphorical sense in chapter 11 in a process of secondary development. Second, whilst the instructions in Deut 6:6–9 are almost identical with 11:18–20, we find the rare verb שָׁנַן in Deut 6:7, whilst Deut 11:19 has the common לָמַד. The most likely explanation is that the familiar term has replaced the unusual one. If Deut 11:18–20 is later than 6:4–5, then it should be observed that this is likely true of most, perhaps even all, of 10:12–11:32. As we have already observed this passage is a loosely structured sermon that repeats ideas and phrases from elsewhere in Deut 5–11. Regular *Numeruswechsel* in this passage is probably not evidence of a complex compositional history, but is a late imitative style. The passage provides a parenetic bridge between the story of the Golden Calf and the opening of the Deuteronomic law. Another

⁵⁰ See K. Finsterbusch, *Deuteronomium: Eine Einführung*, UTB 3626 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 98–99.

⁵¹ For the difficulty in determining the referent of “these words”, see Braulik, “Die Ausdrücke für ‘Gesetz’ im Buch Deuteronomium”, *Biblica* 51 (1970), 39–66; MacDonald, *Deuteronomy*, 125–28.

⁵² Otto, “Deuteronomiumstudien II,” 183.

passage that is certainly later than Deut 6:4–5 is Deut 6:10–19. This text is also characterised by regular *Numeruswechsel*, and clearly breaks the connection between 6:6–9 and 6:20–25, both of which use the second person singular and concern the teaching of children.⁵³ The passage can be seen as an extended exposition on the commandment to love YHWH in 6:5.

But if Deut 6:4–5 does not belong to the latest layer of Deuteronomy, we do not need to conclude that it belongs to the earliest. A helpful starting point is Eckart Otto's proposal for the development of Deuteronomy. Otto identifies three main stages in redactional growth distinguished by the way they provide the book with a narrational location. The reform programme of *Urdeuteronomium* has no narrative setting and is not attributed to Moses. DtrD, the main deuteronomistic redaction of Deuteronomy locates the promulgation of Deuteronomy through Moses on Mount Horeb.⁵⁴ This perspective is later revised by a DtrL which maps a relationship to the Tetrateuch by distinguishing a Horeb and a Moab covenant, and identifying Deuteronomy with the latter.⁵⁵ Otto's proposal for DtrD highlights the way that the narratives

⁵³ Gottfried Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium*, BWANT 93 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1971), 70–74.

⁵⁴ 'Das Siglum steht für die dtr Hauptredaktion des Deuteronomiums und leitet sich von ihrer dekalogischen Strukturierung des Gesetzes im Deuteronomium (Dtn 12–25) ab' (Otto, *Das Deuteronomium* [2000], 4). Otto discusses this redaction in *Das Deuteronomium* [2000], 111–129.

⁵⁵ 'Das Siglum DtrL leitet sich aus der dtr Verbindung des Deuteronomiums mit der Landnahmeüberlieferung des Josuabuches' (Ibid.). Otto discusses this redaction in *Das Deuteronomium* [2000], 129–38. The idea of a deuteronomistic redaction that linked

about the giving of the Decalogue (Deut 5) and the Golden Calf (Deut 9–10) belong together. Their close relationship is indicated by their consistent use of the plural, even if the laws these narratives incorporate – the Decalogue and *Urdeuteronomium* – are expressed in the singular. The story of the giving of the Decalogue ends in 5:28–31 with Moses being commanded to go up on Mount Horeb to receive the commandments. The story of the Golden Calf begins in 9:9 with Moses ascending the mountain. In its present form the narrative link between Decalogue and Golden Calf has been disrupted by the parenetic material in Deut 6–8. Much of this parenetic material is judged to be quite late, and certainly later than DtrD. Thus, Otto views 6:10–19; 7:3b–16, 25–26 and 8:1–9:6 as post-deuteronomistic *Fortschreibungen*, and attributes 6:22–23; 7:1–3a, 17–24 to DtrL. The earliest texts incorporated in DtrD are only to be found in chapter 6, specifically 6:4–9*, 20–25.⁵⁶

Deuteronomy and Joshua originated with N. Lohfink, “Darstellungskunst und Theologie in Dtr 1,6–3,29,” *Bib* 41 (1960), 105–34. For some serious criticisms of the theory of a DtrL see Christoph Nihan, “The Literary Relationship between Deuteronomy and Joshua: A Reassessment,” in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History*, ed. Konrad Schmid and Raymond F. Person, FAT II/56 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 79–114. For my argument I will retain the abbreviation DtrL for the purposes of distinguishing the different narrative reframings of the Deuteronomic lawcode with no assumptions to be drawn about the nature of the relationship between Deuteronomy and Joshua.

⁵⁶ For detailed discussion of Deuteronomy 1–11 by Otto, see now Otto, *Deuteronomium 1,1–4,43*; Otto, *Deuteronomium 4,44–11,32*.

In many respects Otto's proposal provides both a compelling explanation of the shifting narrative perspective in Deuteronomy 1–11 and a persuasive account of the main lines in the development of Deut 1–11. One detail that is not explained in a satisfactory manner is the decision by DtrD to incorporate Deut 6:4–9*, 20–25 between Deut 5 and 9–10. Not only does this break the narrative rehearsal of the events on Mount Horeb, but it also detaches the law concerning centralization from its putative theological justification. Why was the entire narrative not placed before *Urdeuteronomium*? It is easier to explain the present state of the text as the result of the insertion of parenthetic material between Deut 5 and 9–10. The problem with Otto's proposal may be combined with the observation that there is nothing in the story of the Decalogue and the Golden Calf that depends upon Deut 6:4–5. There is no part that is left “hanging in the air,” as Levin has it, if the *Shema* is not present. The purpose of DtrD's narrative is to attribute the Deuteronomic lawcode to Moses who received it from YHWH at Horeb, to distinguish it from the Ten Commandments that the people themselves heard, and to emphasize the importance of obeying the prohibition of idolatry. Whilst DtrD's narrative is not the earliest introduction to *Urdeuteronomium*, it is arguably the earliest introduction that can be recovered with any certainty.

Conclusion

In this paper I have sought to displace the *Shema* from its place as the introduction to *Urdeuteronomium* and the motto of the Josianic reform movement. As all interpreters agree Deut 6:4–5 is a carefully crafted creed, but I have argued that its honing took place somewhat later in the growth of Deuteronomy than is usually thought to be the case. As Braulik suggested YHWH is one in the same way that the beloved in Songs 6:9 is one: the only one worthy of

devotion from Israel. This is what the book of Deuteronomy will come to describe as a covenant relationship. It is rightly understood, as many interpreters have suggested before, as a positive restatement of the first commandment. It should not be understood as Bade first suggested as an expression of mono-Yahwism aimed at the diffusion of Yhwh into many local forms.

As I have demonstrated, whilst Veijola's arguments that the love commandment in 6:5 was a late addition to the book of Deuteronomy cannot be upheld, his essential conclusion was sound. Veijola failed, however, to appreciate the potentially radical consequences of his argument. This can only be seen when it is shown that v. 5 was not a late interpolation, but an integral part of vv. 4–5, or perhaps even vv. 4–9. Veijola continued to hold that v. 4 was the earliest introduction to *Urdeuteronomium*, despite the fact that he took most of the steps needed to undermine this assumption.